

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHIKEB SADDOZAI,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. CEBALLOS, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-00358-NONE-JLT (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

(Doc. Nos. 8-9, 11)

Plaintiff Shikeb Saddozai is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On May 19, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. Nos. 8-9) be denied. (Doc. No. 11.) The magistrate judge found that plaintiff failed to show that he is likely succeed on the merits of his claims or that he will suffer irreparable harm if the court denies his requested preliminary relief. (*Id.* at 2-3). The magistrate judge also found that plaintiff's requested injunction is unrelated to the claims asserted in his complaint pending before this court. (*Id.* at 3.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and provided him fourteen (14) days to file objections thereto. (*Id.* at 3.)

////

1 Plaintiff filed timely objections on May 28, 2020. (Doc. No. 14.) In those objections,  
2 plaintiff raises claims against the prison law library supervisor, M. Lirones. Plaintiff alleges that  
3 Lirones has engaged in retaliatory conduct against plaintiff because plaintiff filed an inmate  
4 grievance regarding denials of his access to the prison law library. (*See id.* at 1-4.)

5 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a  
6 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff's objections,  
7 the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper  
8 analysis. Plaintiff has not shown that he will suffer irreparable harm if the court denies his  
9 request for preliminary relief, and the claims advanced in his objections, like those in his motion  
10 for a preliminary injunction, are unrelated to the claims asserted in his pending complaint.

11 (*Compare* Doc. No. 1 *with* Doc. Nos. 8-9, 14.)

12 Accordingly,

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations filed on May 19, 2020 (Doc. No. 11) are  
14 adopted in full; and,
- 15 2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. Nos. 8-9) is denied.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: **June 2, 2020**

18   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE